

### **Remarks/Arguments**

#### **Substance of the Interview on June 29, 2005**

C. Paul Maliszewski, agent for the Applicants, met with Examiner John W. Winter on June 29, 2005. The following is the substance of the interview:

1. Independent Claims 1 and 23 and dependent Claims 11 and 33 were discussed.
2. U.S. Patent No. 6,339,767 (Rivette et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,154,725 (Donner) were discussed.
3. Applicants agreed to amend Claims 1 and 23 to recite the elements of Claims 11 and 33, respectively.
4. Applicants argued that Rivette and Donner did not teach all the elements of Claims 1 and 23 and did not motivate the modification of the prior art to form the subject invention.
5. The Examiner suggested further defining the terms "client" and "product document" in the claims. The Examiner noted that Claims 1 and 23 would need to recite some further manipulation of data by the respective databases. For example, amending Claims 1 and 23 to recite the limitation of notarizing the product document, as recited in allowed Claims 11 and 33, respectively.

#### **Amendments to Claims 11 and 33**

Applicants have amended Claims 11 and 33 regarding the terms "client" and "product document" recited in these claims. The amendments are fully supported by the specification. "Client" is defined on page 11, line 1 of the specification and "product document" is defined on page 2, line 28 to page 3, line 3. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

#### **The Rejection of Claims 1-10, 14-16, 19-32, 36-38, and 41-44 Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 14-16, 19-32, 36-38, and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,767 (Rivette et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,725 (Donner).

Applicants have cancelled Claims 1 and 23, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Applicants have amended Claim 11 to include all the limitations of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 11 is allowable. Claims 2-10, 14-16, and 19-22 depend from Claim 11, which is patentable in light of the cited references. Thus, Claims 2-10, 14-16, and 19-22 also are patentable in light of the cited references.

Applicants have amended Claim 33 to include all the limitations of Claim 23. Therefore, Claim 33 is allowable. Claims 24-32, 36-38, and 41-44 depend from Claim 33, which is patentable in light of the cited references. Thus, Claims 24-32, 36-38, and 41-44 also are patentable in light of the cited references.

Applicants request that the rejection be removed. Applicants do not intend to give rise to a presumption of surrender.

The Objection of Claims 11-13, 17, 18, 33-35, 39, and 40 as Being Dependent Upon a Rejected Base Claim

Claims 11-13, 17, 18, 33-35, 39, and 40 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Amended Claims 11 and 33 are allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12, 13, 17, and 18, dependent from Claim 11, no longer depend upon a rejected base claim. Also, Claims 34, 35, 39, and 40, dependent from Claim 33, no longer depend upon a rejected base claim. Applicant request that the objection be withdrawn. Applicants do not intend to give rise to a presumption of surrender.

Attorney Docket No. IPCP:107US  
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/931,492  
Reply to Office Action of June 6, 2005  
Date: July 5, 2005



**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Paul Maliszewski".

C. Paul Maliszewski  
Registration No.51,990  
CUSTOMER NO. 24041  
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC  
5555 Main Street  
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406  
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

CPM  
Dated: July 5, 2005